EPA COMMUNITY MEETING FOR THE
SITE ACTIVITIES UPDATE
WEST COUNTY ROAD 112
MIDLAND, MIDLAND COUNTY, TEXAS
HELD APRIL 12, 2011
MIDLAND CENTER, MIDLAND, TEXAS

MR. MALOTT: Thanks for coming out. My name is Vincent Malott. I am with the EPA out of Dallas. I won't use the microphone. I think my voice will carry loud enough in the room here. If it does not, let me know and I will speak a little louder.

The reason we're here is for the West County Road 112 Groundwater Superfund Site, which was just proposed last year in 2010, and it was made final in March of this year.

Before we start the proceedings, Linda will address some of the issues as far as translation.

(INTERPRETER SPEAKING)

MR. MALOTT: Some of these images, I just scrolled through here. They don't show up real well from back there. You may not be able to see them. I'll go through a short presentation to explain to you where we're at, at this point. We're just starting the investigation, some of the activities that we've done to date. There are a series of maps that we've prepared for the site, and those may not be legible. You may not be able to see from back there.

After the presentation, questions and answers, I will be happy to show them to you on the laptop, if you want to see more detail of where your property is or your house is. We could try and enlarge

some on the screen, but the resolution from this projector on this screen is not all that great. So there's going to be some limitations, but I will be happy to stay here as long as necessary. And I believe we have the room until 8:00, maybe a little bit longer. So my time is your time.

We also have representatives from the Texas Commission on Environmental Quality. If you have questions regarding the filtration systems, the sampling performance of those systems, they are available to talk with you, as well.

If you have health questions regarding your groundwater, how it may have impacted your health or your other concerns, we have representatives from the Texas Department of Health Services, and they're here, as well.

So after the presentation and questions and answers, feel free to talk with them. They're the folks in the blue shirts, and they will be happy to help you.

I am a geologist by training. I have been with the EPA for about 24 years. I have been a project manager for Superfund sites since 1997. Before that, I have been doing other corrective action sites for the EPA.

Two sites were actually added to Midland County. These are Federal Superfund sites. One is the Midessa site, which is located west of the airport. It's this red -- or this purple square area down here close to the Midessa RV Park. And then the West County Road site is up here to the northeast, about -- a little under nine miles apart.

EPA is going to be investigating both of these sites on essentially the same timeline and the same path. For us, it's a cost efficiency. Both of these are funneling sites; that is, the EPA is paying a hundred percent of the cost of the investigation and sampling.

So when we have contractors, subcontractors doing work on one project, they can transition to the other site and work on ours, as well. However, what we're here for tonight is the West County Road 112 site.

So here is a presentation outline, some of the topics that I'm going to cover tonight. We're not limited to this, but as far as the information that I have, I'll talk about this first. I'll be happy to answer other questions, or if there's other issues that need to be clarified.

And as we go along, if we develop more

information, we will be expanding the data, the maps, the presentation, to try to provide more answers. We are limited to the data that we have on-hand. And that is the purpose of the investigation out here at the site is to collect more data.

So we'll start with the existing chromium standard. Essentially, what we're working with at this point, we are dealing with a chromium standard under the Safe Drinking Water Act, which is 100 micrograms per liter. That's what we see commonly referred to in regards to the groundwater plume out at the site. That's what, at this point, we are using to define what is above an action level for us regarding filtration systems or even at this point, remediation; however, we're not at that point for remediation.

We are coming out with a new toxicological assessment of hexavalent chromium that will be looking at the infiltration effects from the hexavalent chromium and how this impacts. Obviously, childrens' health will be a primary factor in assessing any kind of new standard. I do not have a timeline at this point of when that standard may change.

The only information that I'm able to gain at this point is that a draft assessment will be available by the end of the year. From there, as they

finalize that data, I will be able to use it as a risk assessment to determine if a lower standard cleanup will be available besides the 100 micrograms.

RESIDENT: Is that -- now, your total chromium standards, is that just hexavalent chromium or is that total?

MR. MALOTT: That's total, and regardless of whether it's trivalent or hexavalent. And let me go ahead -- we have already started looking at the issue of hexavalent and trivalent in the samples that we have collected to date. What we find is that for the most part, 95 percent or so of the total chromium is hexavalent chromium. We will continue to assess the ratio between trivalent and hexavalent. So for us, it essentially works out to be mostly hexavalent.

RESIDENT: So that's 95 percent is what we can go on, because while we're waiting for the EPA's test results for the last four months, we had our -- we privately drew ours, and it was substantially different than what the EPA got. Now, I got the other one, but it was substantially different. So is your test results that you just gave me last week, is that a total chromium?

MR. MALOTT: That is a total chromium. We ran certain wells to see what kind of a range we would

have on high and low concentrations. Most of ours are low concentrations in comparison, but we saw, for the most part, most of it is composed of hexavalent chromium.

Now, the test for hexavalent and total chromium is different. And the holding times are different. And for us, analyzing for total chromium is a method that we use for comparison for a lot of sites. But knowing that most of the contamination is hexavalent, you know, that's something that we can use data to move along. As we need to define this for a risk assessment, then we can run that separate analysis.

But for the most part, we will be running total chromium as a way to compare. That is what the drinking water standard is based on is total chromium.

RESIDENT: But right now, you guys are going out in the field, are you not -- correct me if I'm wrong, please. Are you drawing a heavy metal sample on some wells and then some wells you're drawing both heavy metal and hexavalent?

MR. MALOTT: On this same -- on this sampling we are doing --

RESIDENT: On this sampling this week.

MR. MALOTT: Only totals.

RESIDENT: How come there was two bottles

coming out of one well and only one bottle coming out of the well?

MR. MALOTT: We can do duplicates.

RESIDENT: One was little and one was big. I was told the big one was heavy metals and the little one was hexavalent chromium.

MR. MALOTT: We did that on the last sample, the one in November. We drew a certain number of wells just to see what kind of hexavalent ratio we had for those wells.

RESIDENT: You just did it on the sampling yesterday.

MR. MALOTT: Luis, do we have -- oh, we do have some hex?

MR. LUIS VEGA: We are doing about 25 percent.

RESIDENT: I was wondering whose Ouija board you were seeing to determine where this plume is going.

MR. MALOTT: The plume is on total, not hexavalent.

RESIDENT: And don't apologize for the quality of that slide, because I had to leave my magnifying glass at home because it was embarrassing.

MR. MALOTT: Because of the size of the

area, it is difficult to see on that figure, especially roads.

So the sampling events that we had, the one that we did on November 29th, the one that's ongoing this week, we expect that by -- we have a 21-day turn-around time for the samples, so the 21-day clock starts at the end of this week. So essentially three weeks after this week, we'll have the draft results that we'll share with TCEQ. So if any wells go over the drinking water limit, we'll share that data as soon as we receive it, so that we can then assess whether the filtration system needs to be installed.

It takes our lab about two weeks to do validation on the data and make it final, make sure there are no errors. Then at that point, we will get it mailed out. We were slow in getting this data sent out. I apologize for that, but we made some corrections on our database. I have already heard from some people here who received their letters, and I will discuss that on the next couple of slides.

But we will do a better job as far as getting that data out to you quicker, now that we've got some issues resolved in our database, make sure addresses are correct and getting those letters. So we are changing some formats for that.

Our next sampling event, site-wise, is August. The State also has a sampling event planned in May for the filtration systems, and we will be collecting samples from those wells, to start seeing what kind of high concentration and what kinds of changes we've had in previous years.

So this is the map with poor quality that people cannot see because it's such a large area, and we will have to change the format in order to make this a little more legible.

Maybe we can only show the bottom portion of the map in the large scale. That might assist, that way people can see where their properties are in relation to the plume. We tried to show the entire area on that figure, and on an 8-1/2 by 11, it is difficult, but we're trying to share the data on the form.

(Inaudible question from public)

THE REPORTER: I'm sorry. Can you speak up louder, please?

MR. MALOTT: I'm sorry. We also have a court reporter here present, and the reason is because we wanted to capture all the comments so that we could do a question/answer --

RESIDENT: I would just like to know why this isn't on our site where we can go see the EPA.

MR. MALOTT: We've got maps on our site. And now this is the latest one, and I don't recall right now whether that map is the same. We do have other data that's on there, but this will be posted on there for the next update. So you'll have that as a PDF file, which is larger.

RESIDENT: Yeah, I just went to the site a couple of days ago and there -- it wasn't there.

MR. MALOTT: On the Region 6 web site or the national?

RESIDENT: Our specific site, the site for the e-mail.

MR. MALOTT: The West County Road site had been dropped off the status study sites for a couple of months. I'm not sure why. They moved our internet site around a little bit. We will -- I will go back and check on that and make sure it gets posted.

RESIDENT: Yeah, I couldn't find it off your site by the project when I was looking for it on the update, but I wanted to try to see this map and the quality there, and we want to see this map before we can see our test results.

MR. MALOTT: The fact sheet that we sent out -- and again, I will explain, the results we are trying to get captured in a letter that shows the ranges

of concentration, so this next one will come out sooner so you'll have that about the same time or before the map.

(Reporter admonition to speak up)

MR. MALOTT: Yes. So the sample result letter that went out that's causing confusion at this point, what we showed is the metals -- commonly detected metals in the samples for -- collected from the private wells, what I tried to show here is the ranges and concentrations. That's not specific for your well, but for all the samples that were collected.

And then on the far right column was the drinking water standard. And so people have had questions as to what does that data mean for their well? And in this case, it was just to give a broader background to see where your well fit in with the total site.

And so if you looked and saw what your concentration is, you can see whether you are higher or lower than the range or within that range.

And so this is the part that you're not going to be able to see, but the lab data sheet that came in had a number of columns. And the ones that are important is the one that has the metals listed under anilite, and then the concentration here and then on the

far right is the well number. And so based on the comments that I've received so far, basically people said the letters are not useful for us; that is we don't know what this means for our well, whether our well is good or bad.

If your well had an exceedance of chromium, we would have already coordinated with TCEQ as far as installation of a filtration system. What we've seen, based on the sample results so far, is that a number of people have arsenic concentration over the drinking water limit. That is a factor of the geologic materials in the aquifer. In other words, that is part of the background concentrations. It's not related to the chromium plume. We have not seen a relationship with that. We will continue to look at this though.

The other contaminant or metal that we saw is lead. Lead is typically found in corrosion through funneling in pipes, or the lead solder that's used on pipes or the fixtures. Very infrequent where the lead detection is above the drinking water limit. But again, that's based on household use. And so we have included that data, as well.

But we will be re-sending out these letters with the data, with a better explanation so people understand how that data compares to the drinking

water standards. Since this has not been used, we're changing the format and re-send this data out. And then for the sampling data that we do this month, there will be sent out a -- have that in the format, as well. So we'll continue to make changes and make the data useful on in the year.

Again, this is from a distance. And the quality of the image here, this was the arsenic detections that we saw across the area. We saw arsenic all the way down here below County Road 120, well outside the plume area. We saw areas over here that were well outside the chromium plume that are also exceeding the drinking water limit. And it's just kind of a hit-and-miss, where your well is screened and the factor of well construction.

So far, what we have, we have been using the data from past investigations by both the State and other private parties, Schlumberger and Lear, using the well data provided in there.

We are using the data from the private wells to help build a plume back and see where we needed to start installing monitoring wells. We've done some limited geophysical logging with the US Geological Survey that provides us a better profile of what the aquifers are in this area. And I will show you examples

of that data.

And then we also plan to start installation of our monitoring wells here probably early in May. We'll use that data to start to identify our source areas. This plume -- or this site was listed as a groundwater plume with no identified source area. So we don't have a source area or even a responsible party at this point to pursue for cleanup or investigation of the site. That's why it's being conducted as a funneling by EPA for this area.

We'll also be looking at residential yards as a potential exposure pathway. There, the concern is the wells that have really high concentrations, do we have any kind of build-up of chromium in the soil, and is that another possible exposure pathway? So those yards that have the highest concentrations are the ones we'll be looking at to assess what kind of exposure we may have from that.

So the data that we have so far is, we have some of the chromium contamination that's been detected in what's called the Lear property. They have a -- quite a few wells installed in that area.

One of the facts that's interesting is a lot of that chromium contamination, though, is substantially less than what we have south of I-20. So

we know we have a release, but I don't know specifically if the release is all coming from their property or if it's coming from other adjacent properties.

There's another property nearby, B & W, which is right across the facility. People have probably heard that name. They also had a detection of chromium back in the, I guess, mid to late eighties.

Again, I don't know specifically that the release occurred on the property. So we may be looking at multiple source areas here or there is maybe one large source area. But that's one of the things that will be as part of the investigation.

We also have two other trichloroethane plumes. Yes, ma'am?

RESIDENT: When you're talking about source areas, have y'all taken a look at just to the west of where the old pit is? There was a company that was a pipe company where that whole area is now condemned. Have y'all looked at that?

MR. MALOTT: Well, we have not. Part of it is, in this case, if you look at the chromium plume, there's two water supply wells on this property here and both of those are clean.

RESIDENT: Right.

MR. MALOTT: I've looked at the well

records for those. Those wells are screened essentially across both aquifers. If there was chromium running in the upper aquifer or the Ogallala, then we should have had detection in those wells.

RESIDENT: Right.

MR. MALOTT: So that's kind of a benchmark. And that's immediately, I believe, downgradient from what you're talking about. So we'll be -- we needed to find exactly where the material is coming in from.

So the trichloroethane plume is coming in on the process area, just across the upper edge of the chromium plume, and just barely -- just crosses over I-20 there.

And then we have another small plume over here that's being handled through TCEQ for the Wood Group here, that they're addressing separately. So that's a smaller area, and that's outside our investigation.

These other investigations, they do give us existing background data, particularly groundwater flow velocity. Estimates have ranged from 60 to 120 feet per year. If those velocities would hold true for this area, then that would indicate that the chromium plume, if it did originate north of I-20, is

very old.

Even if it originated south of I-20, that's still a fairly old plume, as far as when the release could have occurred. So one of the things we'll be assessing is exactly what kind of changes to the groundwater flow velocity and how did that impact the distribution of the chromium. And then, of course, using the existing monitoring wells to collect geophysical data.

So this is the general flow direction that we have, based on the existing data. As we install our own monitoring wells, we will be filling this out and adding to it.

And here is a geophysical log that we've collected from a monitoring well. This gives us a sense of the upper aquifer, which is the Ogallala. This is the one that appears to transmit the bulk of the contamination as it goes across I-20 and goes into the private residential well fields. We think the base of it is somewhere around this area, below 50 feet, maybe 60 feet, as we prepared geophysical logs.

Here's another one. Both of these logs were prepared by the US Geological Survey. And it's estimated that our contact is somewhere in here between the two aquifers. What we've noticed between wells

completed above and below in the two sands is that we have water level elevations of up to two feet difference. So we know that the interval that separates those two is actually pretty good as far as water levels and flow.

What's happening, we think, is so far as the chromium plume is moving across in the Ogallala, as it intersects with private wells that are sand-packed or screened up into both aquifers, that provides a vertical drain den for it to migrate downward then to the Trinity aquifer, the lower one.

So as we move across we will be using this data to assess what the total impact is.

And this is -- especially sitting in the back, is pretty difficult. What we propose at this point is a series of wells, monitoring wells that we will be installing. Here right on the south end of this residential area, along 112 and 114, those wells we want to look at to see if both Ogallala and the Trinity are equally contaminated at that point. Because that changes, obviously, how we will do the cleanup out here at the site. If they're not, then it may give us some hope for expediting the cleanup, if this is a funneling Superfund site.

We have other wells we proposed in this

area to see what kind of impact from the pumping on these other private wells. As we move down to 120, down here across and all the way to the toe of the plume, we'll be looking at what the distribution of chromium is in the two aquifers, to assess what the impact is from the private wells.

We have a preliminary agreement with Midland County to access the right-of-ways on the county roads, so when we start the well installation program, you will see our rigs. That's where we'll be installing the wells out there in that area.

As we start to fill this in, we may be coming to private landowners to ask for access to install wells. But for now, we're going to try to install them on the right-of-ways to give us a broad perspective on what this plume is doing.

We also have been talking with TxDOT, Texas Department of Transportation, to access the service roads along I-20. What we're interested in here is whether the high concentrations of chromium, do they start south of I-20 or do they start north of I-20? Because at this point, we don't have anything high enough or equally high in concentration from the south and north side of I-20. So we're interested to see what has happened, whether we have a contributing source from

the north side or maybe there's another source that's present south of I-20.

We're also going to be looking to the area to the north of what the Lear property is. There, we want to start accessing on City of Midland right-of-ways, if we can work out an agreement with them. We're still talking with them about the kind of insurance and identification requirements. So if we can get access through there, we will be installing a series of wells along the north end there, to see what kind of chromium contamination, if any, is migrating into the area; and if it isn't, then maybe that we've got, at least, the top end of the source area identified for that area.

As we get all this data, we will be sharing this with you, as well, updating our site maps. And then we'll be going to the next round of well installation. Hopefully, we'll start to find the source area that we can identify.

Now, there's some -- I will show you some other a little bit more close up. The overall project schedule, what we're trying to accomplish is try to complete it toward the end of 2012.

The number of factors that can influence the schedule, and we'll update this as we go through the

project is, one, do we find more than one source area, is there just one source area; getting access agreements to install wells and collect the data, because a lot of this will start to be on private property and we'll have to work with the landowners to get that access. And then, of course, also, the cost for the project itself.

We already have funding for this project, so we can start our well installation. We can continue on with the sampling of the wells. Obviously, if this starts to expand into multiple source areas, if we start to have a large number of monitoring wells that we need to increase, that could impact the budget and how the project completion works out.

The feasibility study would be March of 2013, and this is the target for us, is having a Record of Decision, which is a summary of all the data, the risk assessment, who the source area is, as well as how the site can be cleaned up and what the cost is. And so that's the goal is for 2013.

As we go through the project and we have -- if there's issues that affect that schedule, then we'll adjust accordingly and keep everyone up-to-date.

I want to talk a little bit about the community involvement activities. As we go through this

process, there's going to be -- the terminology, the data. We have a couple of ways to assist the community advisory group. One is through the Technical Assistance Services For Communities and the Technical Assistance Grant. We have used both of these mechanism in the Superfund sites here in Texas.

The cost for the Technical Assistance Services, essentially, we have a contract and we have a contractor that can provide independent support for the community group. They're not the contractor that works for me doing the field work out there and collecting the data and writing the reports. What they do is they can provide explanations. They can help you understand the data, help you understand the process, the technologies involved. So it's like an independent contractor, but we pay for them, and they can provide support to the community group, as well. So that's one way. We've done this on a couple of projects. I know that their contract is expiring in May or June. There will be another one, and then we'll private fund it. So that's an option to help the community understand the process.

The contact is here. And June has summary sheets for both of these mechanisms to provide support to your community. The contact is Donn Walters. He's in our EPA Region 6 office.

Like I said, June has the sheets. That way, you won't have to copy them down. And you can contact them directly to find out more about trying to get these assistance grants.

And the other one is a Technical Assistance Grant. It's a little more -- has a little more administrative requirements. Typically requires some percent matching contribution, either from the citizens or in-kind services. So we provide bulk funding, and then the community will do something as far as organization. There has to be a true group forum, because there is administrative and reporting requirements of how that money is spent. However, it allows the community group to hire their own independent expert. And it's not an EPA contact. So there's a benefit there to the community group that can go hire whoever they want to, but there is reporting requirements to ensure that the money is spent on those activities. So it's a trade-off between someone having to do paperwork versus less paperwork on that.

So there's -- this is the other option. And Janetta Coats in our EPA office is the contact for that. Again, it's on the sheet, so you can contact her and talk with her about the procedures for one of these.

So that's a quick summary of where we

stand. Right now, the schedule is we're planning to start installing monitoring wells early in May, assuming we have all of our access agreements in place. We'll be installing those wells at this project, and when we're done, we should be moving over to Midessa and start installing wells there.

As we sample the wells and get the data back, then we will reassess where we are as far as source areas and the extent of the plume, adjust the well locations and go back out for another round of well installation. So we've got quite a few activities planned already for this year, and we'll just keep taking one bite at a time until we find the source and the responsible parties and we'll take it from there.

Yes, ma'am?

RESIDENT: So going back to where you were doing your monitoring wells and where you're going back to the west, I'm sure you're probably aware that we have a draw that runs down on the west side of Midland and comes down and --

(Reporter admonition to speak up)

MR. MALOTT: She asked if you could speak up some.

RESIDENT: I'm sure that you're aware of (inaudible) to do monitoring wells to the west of the

plume, that we have a draw that runs through the west side of Midland and down across Interstate 20 and back toward this area. At some point, if you're detecting any kind of chromes, will y'all be actually looking at that as a source?

MR. MALOTT: Well, we'll be -- you mean outside of this plume area here?

RESIDENT: Yes, sir.

MR. MALOTT: Well, if the -- the wells so far are planned within the plume area. So --

RESIDENT: Okay.

MR. MALOTT: -- at this point, there's not an effort or a plan to expand outside this current -- the plume.

RESIDENT: Is there a way to tell, at this point, and obviously maybe not, if the migration is coming from the west, northwest, or possibly from the west?

MR. MALOTT: Well, we'll have water level data that we'll be using to build our flow maps and eventually the groundwater flow model for this area, and from there they will be using particle tracking to look at how the source migrated from where it was to essentially the plume it is now, using flow velocities as well as the characteristics of the aquifer that we

built as we collect data from these monitoring wells and the geophysical logging.

RESIDENT: Thank you.

RESIDENT: She was just saying it's where they just put in that I-20 wildlife refuge or whatever. It's a little bit -- that's what it's called.

MR. MALOTT: Further west?

RESIDENT: They just funded that deal, and they're fixing to -- it's for bird watching and this and that, and that's where she's talking about. It's just a main draw that -- it's kind of a retention basin for rainwater.

MR. MALOTT: Well, one of the things that hampers us through an investigation is when we look at the database, not all the private wells we have records of. So if you have a record from the well driller who installed the wells in this area, and you can share it with us, that's great. A lot of times, if you don't have records, we have to guess, make some assumptions.

The more well records that we have for an area, the better off we are, as far as assessing how those individual wells impact the plume or why concentrations differ between neighbors on individual wells.

Yes, ma'am, in the back?

RESIDENT: I just wanted to add that Schlumberger has another plant on the other side of 80, and twice a week, they release a ton of water that goes running down Comanche Street and then crosses over to the draw in which Mrs. King was just talking about.

MR. MALOTT: Okay.

RESIDENT: And I would like to see y'all check into why they are releasing all that water twice a week, and enough to almost float a car down Comanche Street, and it runs into this draw that she's talking about and out towards us.

MR. MALOTT: We will follow up and check.

RESIDENT: I have several questions. Can I continue?

MR. MALOTT: Yes.

RESIDENT: How fast did you say the plume is moving right now?

MR. MALOTT: Well, that's a good question. We don't know the plume itself. All I have is data that's been provided by other facilities. And so there, I think they estimated something 60 plus feet per year. And Schlumberger, I believe, the estimate was 120 feet per year.

For comparison purposes in Odessa, we see average velocities in the hundred to 120 feet per year

for essentially the same sequence. There, the Ogallala is unsaturated. The Trinity is essentially all but saturated. So for the chrome sites that we have in Odessa, we have very similar flow velocities. So it's pretty similar between the two areas, even though they're separated by quite a few miles.

RESIDENT: Is it affected by rainwater at all?

MR. MALOTT: Well, the water levels are affected by the rainfall.

RESIDENT: But I mean, the movement of the plume?

MR. MALOTT: Well, the flow velocity itself is dependent on both the gradient, as well as the characteristics of the sand aquifer itself. We will run some pump tests to get a better idea. Because one of the things that could be affecting it is obviously some really high pumping demands on private wells or even some of the public wells. That could change some of the flow velocities, and that is something that we will be looking at, as well, because that will impact our flow model and exactly how the plume came to be in the current position it is.

RESIDENT: Midland has told us that they don't have water for us, so if y'all come in with a

Superfund, how are we supposed to get water to go in the site?

MR. MALOTT: Well, we have the same answer. There is not sufficient water supply to this date for this area. It doesn't mean that we won't keep asking. At some point, as we go through developing the alternatives for preventative exposure to the chromium plume, it's something we continue to follow up with the City of Midland. Obviously, it's not our water supply. We can ask and we can coordinate with them, but it is their city, and so I don't have any special powers to --

RESIDENT: So y'all can't sue the City?

MR. MALOTT: No.

RESIDENT: Okay. Because I had heard rumor that you would sue the City to get us water.

MR. MALOTT: We can pursue responsible parties for the contamination, but not the City. That's where our portion ends.

RESIDENT: Right. If you can find who did it?

MR. MALOTT: Right.

RESIDENT: Realistically, then, it's not going to be in our lifetime, the cleanup?

MR. MALOTT: No, the cleanup -- her question was, in her lifetime, I guess, cleanup of the

total groundwater plume. Well, there's really two factors on this. One, is whether that's all the plume there is. Two, if the cleanup standards change, so if an NCL will be lowered, let's say it's dropped to 10 micrograms per liter instead of 100.

And what we've tried to do here on this map, just for reference, because we don't know if there is going to be a change in the hexavalent standard for chromium or whether it would stay at a hundred, what we've tried to do is plot both the 5 and the 10-microgram per liter, just to show you what the greater extent of that contamination is.

If we had to clean up the entire plume, yes, it would be decades on the cleanup itself. It would be a very expensive project if it was a funding project. Again, hopefully we find a responsible party. But we'll see.

RESIDENT: So basically, what is the plan? To get anything that's over a hundred? Is that your remediation, your cleanup?

MR. MALOTT: Well, that's -- I'm trying to kind of lay the framework, but that would be contained in the Record of Decision in the proposed plan, explaining our cleanup. Right now, the drinking water limit is 100. So that -- for planning purposes, that's

what we work with.

However, because they are reassessing the hexavalent chromium, that's why we're looking at a larger area than just the hundred. So for example, this is the boundary of the hundred micrograms per liter. Yet, total detections have been all the way down to here, and that's at five. So we will continue to investigate as if we may have a larger plume. And if the standard doesn't change or the draft assessment doesn't change the numbers that we're looking at, well, you know, we still have the data. But we'll proceed ahead.

RESIDENT: I was reading on your site about the -- I can't remember where it's at, but the plating company that the United States Coast Guard have by one of the rivers, and you guys have just released a study of two years of a trench where you dug it and put the iron fillings in there, and it actually stopped the hexavalent chromium. Is that a consideration that you could do for the people that aren't --

MR. MALOTT: I believe that was in South Carolina at a Coast Guard facility. That's one of the technologies that you can use, and it's called a -- it's essentially a treatment zone or a treatment wall. And it converts the hexavalent to trivalent chromium as the

groundwater flows through a specially-constructed wall. Essentially, it still has the same permeability or the ability for water to pass through that wall as it does a regular aquifer.

One kind of a drawback for this area and what we're seeing is that because the water is so hard, we have a lot of other material in that groundwater. The concern is going to be whether that reactive wall starts to plug up, with time. We have seen cases where the wall performance degrades between eight and ten years after installation. So there's some drawbacks with going with that approach. It is something that we would look at or consider during our screening approach with the technologies, and maybe there's something better by that point. But it is a passive approach, though.

RESIDENT: Thank you.

MR. MALOTT: Yes?

RESIDENT: I know you said you were 60 feet per year or 120 feet per year.

MR. MALOTT: Right.

RESIDENT: Is it -- I guess I live further to the west. Do I need -- is it going to continue -- is it going to just go south or is it spreading out?

MR. MALOTT: Well, essentially what you

see here is the flow direction from, you know, from the sampling data itself. We don't have, obviously, the monitoring --

RESIDENT: So we don't know if it's spreading wider?

MR. MALOTT: Well, as you can see here, it's spread out in this area. There's a lot of pumping demand in that area. So the more pumping wells we have, the more chance it's going to disperse and move away from that central axis or the center line of the plume itself.

RESIDENT: It's basically like taking a straw and a big, like a plate of water. And if we quit using the water as much and we're over there on the west and you guys start using it more, then it's going to continue.

RESIDENT: That's what I wonder. I don't have it right now. I'm out of that plume right now to the side of it, but that doesn't mean that I'm --

MR. MALOTT: Right. And so we've got -- we actually have the one well in the flank there to see whether we have -- again, we don't know if it's a uniform movement between both the Ogallala and the Trinity. As the plume crosses I-20, if there's higher concentrations on the other side, what we see is the

bulk of the contamination is in the Ogallala. And then as it moves in to the private wells, likely starts to have that mixing. But we'll need to assess exactly how badly the Trinity has been impacted.

RESIDENT: Mr. Malott, while we're still on this water subject, why two bottles on some and one bottle on some, on the testing?

MR. MALOTT: On the big bottles or the little bottles?

RESIDENT: Why would there be a little bottle and a big bottle on some wells and just a big bottle on the other wells?

MR. MALOTT: Well, the hexavalent chromium analysis does not go back to our contract or lab.

RESIDENT: So why didn't you test my well for hexavalent chromium?

MR. MALOTT: Well, sir, next time we change -- what's the concentration?

RESIDENT: But what's the criteria if you're looking to see where the plume is going, as far as the hexavalent chromium? Or is that red dot just based on -- or that red thing just based on total?

MR. MALOTT: It's based on total, not hexavalent.

RESIDENT: I see.

RESIDENT: Sir, you were talking a while ago about you had interest in some of the companies that you were looking in. The Wood Group came up. Do they have a large concentration of chromium or is it follicles? What do you have?

MR. MALOTT: No, it's trivalent.

RESIDENT: It's trivalent?

MR. MALOTT: Right. And that plume is -- it's on the other map, but you may not be able to see it from there. It's really confined to this area up in here.

RESIDENT: Another question and we're looking -- everybody is looking at this, and there's been all finger pointing toward Schlumberger. Is there anything, at this point, that you would be able to see that Schlumberger had that much chromes that you would even consider that?

MR. MALOTT: Well, again, the site was listed as a plume with no defined source area. So we're starting with that, that we don't know the source.

Again, at this point, the reason we have the question marks separating the chromium contamination that we have detected in this area versus the areas south of I-20 is the differences. So in this case, there's a well with over three milligrams per liter.

The well up here has a little over -- well, it's a little over .1 milligram per liter. So we don't see the high concentrations north of I-20. And it's something we will be looking at. Again, is it because everything's migrated out, the wells are not in the right spot, or they're not screened in the right interval, for comparison purposes? Or is it because we've got multiple source areas and we've got an area to the north and maybe an area to the south? What's not clear is how these relatively low concentrations, do they actually go all the way across I-20? Do they enter in that area or is there other areas that we haven't seen yet with high concentrations that just hasn't been detected?

It's really -- the chrome sites that we have in Odessa, we don't see the source areas where it's just essentially very low levels. We always see at least some wells that have high concentrations similar to what's in the rest of the plume. And so right now, we're going to be looking to see if we can find those high concentrations north of I-20.

RESIDENT: So what we're seeing is no source area, everything kind of gets slowed down, and we get in a funding bottleneck. Correct me if I'm wrong, please, if we find the source area, then money comes in

from them, which hastens cleanup. No source area, no money, no water from Midland, because obviously they're running a big old pipeline out 191, and I don't even know where my County Commissioner is at.

RESIDENT: Right here.

RESIDENT: Excellent. What's going on with our --

COMMISSIONER: I can't answer you anything about the City of Midland, because that's a different entity. A lot of guys -- I have been talking to some of the council members and the mayor, but that's the best thing I can do.

RESIDENT: How often is this brought up?

COMMISSIONER: It's brought up pretty often. As a matter of fact, I just met with some of them yesterday.

RESIDENT: Yesterday, the day before this meeting? I got my well results the week before this meeting. I got my well tested a day before this meeting. And then what happened in the four months prior?

No, I'm really just kind of frustrated. I'm sorry if it sounds like aggravation. But I'm just really frustrated, and I'm not getting any good answer. This is the same answers I got at our TCEQ meeting. God

bless them. They did a great job, but I'm just...

MR. MALOTT: Well, the sampling results that we saw from November-December, we didn't see, really, a change in the plume from what had been detected earlier. That's why we're sampling again to see if there's a change in the plume before we start the monitoring well installation.

So the private well data provides a starting point for us to start installing monitoring wells to assess what the plume looks like.

RESIDENT: And Mr. Malott, why wasn't my well tested for hexavalent chromium?

MR. MALOTT: I don't know where your well is.

RESIDENT: I can break down my magnifying glass or we can blow it up big on the screen and I could point at it. You know, with TCEQ it was a big deal about confidentiality, so I don't know.

MR. MALOTT: Well, after the meeting, let me know your address and we can see where the -- where your address is and figure something out.

RESIDENT: Okay. I'm concerned. I don't even know if I can water my garden or what.

RESIDENT: Yeah. Is there any studies -- do you guys have any studies on the plants? I mean, I

know you have it in the soil, but what about our gardens?

MR. MALOTT: Well, the Texas Department of Health Services will look at that issue, as well. There's been questions about the chromium in pecan crops, vegetable gardens. You know, the material safety -- they've actually talked to some folks at Texas A&M. And please feel free to talk with them and they can give you what they found out.

Basically, the hexavalent, when you do the analysis, it shows up as trivalent, and so the chromium is in a more benign form than the hexavalent. So it's really difficult to assess whether there has been any impact at all.

In the concentrations that may impact a pecan tree, likely we see the tree itself suffering as far as the growth and appearance itself.

RESIDENT: If your plants are affected, what will you see? Are they yellowing? Do they grow in a deformed shape? Odd-shaped fruit? I mean...

MR. MALOTT: I don't know about that. I don't have that kind of information. Probably more focused on what's happening in the soil, if the wind is blowing dust in the soil and exposing the pathway. Obviously, hexavalent chromium from an exposure

standpoint, an inhalation is a primary concern, so that would be another way to be exposed besides just --

RESIDENT: I'm sure when we take a shower in the winter and we're breathing it in --

(Reporter admonition to speak up)

RESIDENT: You know, yeah, when we take a shower with hot water in the winter, you're breathing it in. But you know, you guys talk about these maximum limits that you have. And I know the last time you raised the chromium was, what, '91, '92? Last time y'all --

MR. MALOTT: It was raised from 50 to 100.

RESIDENT: Right, in '91, '92? It's been a while. But I mean, yeah, you know, we ingest this. It's not like -- for us, it's not okay, we have come in contact with a big amount of it and then we walk away and we're not exposed. We are being exposed every day, day in and day out. This is long-term exposure. And I've been looking over the rat studies, you know. And when asked, you know, is there any health affects for us, and it's like, oh, well, you know, we have gastrointestinal stuff, that's not what your lab rats are saying. That's not what your tests are saying. You guys are seeing cancer increases that you are not forthcoming about to us. You can find it if you dig and

you work and you spend hours looking for it, but you guys have done several studies. The studies are out there. So I mean, we're getting it in our soil, we're getting it in our water, we're drinking it. But we're not just getting exposed and walking away. It's day in and day out.

But as far as even the plants, I mean, there's -- look at all the sites in Odessa alone. They've been there for a long time. It just seems like you guys would have more stuff. You've got plenty of ample opportunity. I mean, there's lots of dirty spots that you have had for years. Why aren't some of our tax dollars going to study this stuff?

MR. MALOTT: Well, and part of the -- is the right analysis of the plant tissues themselves, how you detect the hexavalent chromium. The cases they have seen so far where they analyzed the plant tissue is showing up as trivalent. So the plants are converting the chromium to that state. So the exposure is different through a plant tissue.

It is a very difficult analysis in order to get a true assessment of what the health impact is.

RESIDENT: (Inaudible.)

(Reporter admonition to speak up)

THE INTERPRETER: Can she repeat the

question, please?

MR. MALOTT: She had a question on what is the -- what is the level of chromium that the plants are being exposed to. And I don't have that information. But I mean, the researchers at Texas A & M --

RESIDENT: The studies I was looking at, they were only like 200 parts per billion, where we're looking at our neighbors with over 5,000 parts per billion.

RESIDENT: Well, it was supposed to be the ones that they are actually injecting the rats and stuff with that. (Inaudible.)

MR. MALOTT: And as far as the health affects, that's -- that's outside my area of expertise. I would imagine it would be contained in the assessment coming out on the hexavalent chromium, and then also the representatives from Texas Department of Health Services.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: We can speak with you after the meeting, if you like, and discuss with you what you like.

RESIDENT: We're talking about all the dangers and the health problems existing to all of us. Many of us are sick. Many of us have lost animals and are still losing animals, and it's getting worse by the

day. It's not getting better. It's getting worse.

Have y'all had any data? I know that EPA does data. I know the Health Department does data. CDC has done data. Have y'all gone to any of your national laboratories and have you sent any samples to any of the national laboratories to give us an answer in what really is the situation here and how it can be dealt with?

MR. MALOTT: An analysis of what kind of samples?

RESIDENT: Your water, your soil, whatever.

MR. MALOTT: Well, the water samples goes through the EPA Houston laboratory or the EPA contract laboratory on that. That's who does the analysis for us.

RESIDENT: Do you have any data at all or can you get me data from any of your national laboratories, like Sandia or some of them -- you've got one on the eastern seaboard, you have got one in California that might help give people data on what they possibly would need.

MR. MALOTT: And I'm not quite sure on the kind of data that you're looking for. Data from the groundwater sample?

RESIDENT: From the groundwater samples, from the actual soil samples of what has been happening.

MR. MALOTT: The soil samples will be part of the investigation when we assess what the impact is to residential yards, from just using historic use of the high concentrations in water wells. The water samples themselves, though, go through our own laboratory program. So the analysis that you're provided on these wells is through either the Houston lab or through our contract program.

RESIDENT: One more question, sir. Is it possible, you know, I know that you -- that the chromium levels can be detected in the blood. So I mean, we've got the Health Department here for people that are -- I was wondering why the Health Department hasn't offered to test the people to see if they have chromium in their blood, if they're concerned, the people that feel like they might be getting sick from this?

MR. MALOTT: And I couldn't explain that, but Tina can. Tina?

MS. TINA WALKER: We thought about doing biological sampling, because a lot of information you read says you can test hair, blood, urine for chromium. The problem is that it doesn't tell you that the only result you get is Chromium III. So there is no way to

do biological samples as to how much hexavalent chromium you're exposed to, because once it reaches the body, it converts to III. And so when you do a biological sample, it just gives us III.

RESIDENT: Yeah, but if you have a hundred times the normal limit of trivalent --

MS. TINA WALKER: That's part of the problem, too. Because your body has to have Chromium III to process protein, sugars and fats. And so it's --

RESIDENT: It's not in huge quantities.

MS. TINA WALKER: In some people, it is, because you can get it from a lot of different sources. And I understand what you're saying and I'm not saying that you're wrong.

What I'm saying is that it's hard to find a lab that will do biological sampling for -- if someone is looking for hexavalent chromium, because they're going to give us total chromium. I mean, that's all they're going to do.

RESIDENT: All I'm saying is maybe if you guys would ask us -- like, for example, they've lost several pets. I mean, you know, maybe they're willing to have a necropsy to find out.

MS. TINA WALKER: We can't do animals. We've had issues with other sites and you can't --

RESIDENT: Well, you guys need to change your way of thinking, because this whole world is just getting more and more polluted. There's hardly anywhere you can go anymore that there is safe drinking water. It's not getting any better. So you guys have to come out and start changing and look. I mean, we're killing our planet, and it's not getting any cleaner. So you guys have got to come up and start changing your standards so you can start being more progressive in keeping up with the filth that we've all put in our planet. I'm ashamed to be a person, most of the time.

RESIDENT: And with Cindy and Brian -- with Cindy and Brian, I can't remember the last dog that I buried in the last five years from natural causes. It's all been some funky cancer. Not old dogs, young dogs, old dogs. They're out there laying in it and they're drinking it.

MS. TINA WALKER: And I do hear what you're saying. And we have the same problem at another one of the sites we're working on. Because we are the Health Department and we are dealing with people, they will not let us deal in the animals. We've tried at this other site to try to get them hooked up with people that are willing to test the animals, and maybe that's something that we need to look at here. The Health

Department can't do it, but there are people out there who are willing to look at it. And we can try to work with you to see if we can get them tested. But the Health Department can't do it.

RESIDENT: Well, what have you learned from wherever you go, whatever you guys learn, it's going to help other people later on when they get contaminated soil, water, air?

MS. TINA WALKER: I agree with you, because it -- like in the other site that we're working on, the question was are the animals acting as sentinels for human health? And so it took us several years to find somebody outside of the Health Department that would come in and start looking at the animals. There has just now been -- it's been six years since I first started trying to get people to look at it.

RESIDENT: The plants, the animals, all of it --

MS. TINA WALKER: No, I understand. We want to get a whole picture. You want to look at everything. I do understand that.

RESIDENT: Well, it would just be so much more beneficial for y'all in the future.

MS. TINA WALKER: It would be beneficial for everybody.

RESIDENT: When they looked at the plague, they were testing the animals.

RESIDENT: I just want to know what else you've got to put before us tonight?

MR. MALOTT: That's it as far as the information that I have for you. So it's strictly question and answer.

RESIDENT: Okay. I just wondered if you had anything else you needed to do.

MR. MALOTT: I've said mine, other than explaining something I've said before.

RESIDENT: Okay.

RESIDENT: Did you change the numbers, like the test well numbers? Will our well number still be the same as it was with TCEQ?

(Reporter admonition to speak up)

MR. LUIS VEGA: Folks, we want to have the court reporter write all of your questions down so we can document it. That's why I'm trying to run around here.

RESIDENT: I want to know if y'all changed the identification numbers to our wells or are they still the same?

MR. MALOTT: All the well numbers have stayed the same. We have added new well numbers as

we've come across wells.

One of the things that we found is that we'll go to a home that's now vacant, phone number doesn't work where we can't get hold of the resident that used to be there or who owns the property.

So we also find that there are multiple wells on some properties. So we've actually been assigning new numbers for those ones, because that gives us a point of reference then for other potential pathways for migration.

There's also been some location for us to do a geophysical log and find additional there.

RESIDENT: So you're saying my well number is the same as it was with TCEQ when we started in '09?

MR. MALOTT: We can check the record.

RESIDENT: Because we've been consistent where they've tested all the way through.

MR. MALOTT: We used a database that was developed by TCEQ and, of course, they built on to it.

RESIDENT: The obvious reason I asked is, on the map, I couldn't find our well number.

MR. MALOTT: Okay.

RESIDENT: How many more test wells are you going to do prior to --

MR. MALOTT: Well, I don't have an answer.

And the question is, until we know the source, until we get the plume defined, then we will know we have enough.

RESIDENT: How many have they got at this point right now?

MR. MALOTT: We have not put in any.

RESIDENT: No?

MR. MALOTT: Huh-uh. But we have done the first round of sampling the private wells. We are doing another round this week. We have been working with Midland County, the City of Midland, private landowners, TxDOT to get access. And so we have been going through that process.

RESIDENT: I was told two different times that they will come out and check mine out and never shows up and never try to call.

MR. MALOTT: Okay. When was this?

RESIDENT: They called us and said that they would be in town that week and they would test, but they never did test.

MR. MALOTT: And was this back in November?

RESIDENT: That was the last time.

MR. MALOTT: Okay.

RESIDENT: November was the last time.

MR. MALOTT: All right.

RESIDENT: Right after we had the last meeting down up here, they were supposed to have been out there about a week later and never did.

MR. MALOTT: Okay. Well, if you can stick around a little bit as we end, and we will get that information --

RESIDENT: I will.

MR. MALOTT: -- figure out where you are.

RESIDENT: Yeah, we're outside of -- we're just west of it.

RESIDENT: About a block and a half from the neighbor right there.

MR. MALOTT: Okay. All right.

RESIDENT: Appreciate it.

MR. MALOTT: Yes?

RESIDENT: One other question, then I quit. I follow on your map that you have up in the north side, by Horseshoe Arena. Is that the pit we're seeing where all that is?

MR. MALOTT: Well, if you're talking about the pit or the caliche pit, that's actually on this piece of property right in here.

RESIDENT: Okay. That's pretty much where all that is?

MR. MALOTT: That's where the old caliche

pit that you see on the aerial photos.

RESIDENT: Yes.

RESIDENT: (Inaudible.)

(Reporter admonition to speak up)

MR. MALOTT: If you could speak in the microphone so the court reporter --

RESIDENT: It comes right up the edge of there.

RESIDENT: I'm just curious, you know, back -- I couldn't tell if that first part of it was up where the old AMF Tuboscope is at. They told me it was.

RESIDENT: On the map problems, sir, if you guys turn that sideways, then you can get a bigger map in the mail. You know, you were talking about maybe doing it in two.

MR. MALOTT: Yeah, we'll change it where maybe we split the map and show one half in one side and the other half on the other. That would also allow us to enlarge the picture.

RESIDENT: And we don't have our web site listed on the flyer or link to the page that you guys are going to be getting to us so we can get updates on.

MR. MALOTT: Okay. We'll add that and we will put that link in there, as well. So when we send that back out --

RESIDENT: I mean, with TCEQ, they used to send us notifications when they update the site. So maybe that would be something that you could do for us, too.

MR. MALOTT: So is that something people want, as well? Because it's a question of what's the best way to share data. So --

RESIDENT: The web site, mail-outs, something that -- anything really important coming up.

RESIDENT: We're starved for information, basically. We want everything that you have.

MR. MALOTT: Yes?

RESIDENT: Do you have names with the numbers?

MR. MALOTT: We do.

RESIDENT: I think that our numbers have been -- instead of listing it as 013, it looks like it's 031 on the map.

MR. MALOTT: Okay. We can check against that. If you'll leave your information with either Jason or June, and we can check against our records to make sure it's going to the right spot. Any other questions? Yes?

RESIDENT: If you do find who did it and you start the cleanup and everything, how long is it

going to last or how long will it be or --

MR. MALOTT: How long will the cleanup take?

RESIDENT: Are y'all going to try to clean it up?

MR. MALOTT: Yes, we will try to clean it up. You know, the aquifer is something that's used as a drinking water supply.

RESIDENT: The only reason I ask is they told us a while, maybe a year ago, that it would take 40, 50, a hundred years to try to clean it up.

MR. MALOTT: We don't have an estimate for how long, but it would be decades in order to get something this large. Yes, it would be an extensive cleanup. And again, the plume --

RESIDENT: Why can't Midland bring us water?

MR. MALOTT: If there's a water supply that we can extend and we can look at what's the best way to deliver that, and we can go from there. Right now I don't have a water supply.

RESIDENT: I don't mind paying a water bill.

RESIDENT: That goes back to our County Commissioner, County elected officials, ma'am. I'm

sorry. I wished I had an answer for you.

RESIDENT: We know that, but we know that Midland doesn't have water. But I'm saying bring us water where we can have our own water.

MR. MALOTT: Well, if -- and I cannot create a water utility district for you. I can't create that. Someone has to be able to manage the system, if they're going to do a tax, however they're going to fund themselves, whether it's through the rates or tax, whatever. I can -- I can make connections to households, but someone has to have the water.

RESIDENT: This goes back to my conversation with you earlier today and a couple of weeks ago, about looking at the source that we discussed, and if it's pliable. We may have a source, folks, within three miles of us. We may have. It's not definitive, but if it's there, you will have the opportunity.

I also know a person that's started his own water district and did it for much, much less money than what we've been hearing about in the newspapers, okay? All I can tell you is this is going to be up to Mr. Malott to get somebody out to possibly grant us the water, to see if it's pliable. And then we can make some kind of arrangements as a group to go from there.

MR. MALOTT: But again, someone will have to form that utility district if they're going to do that, and how they're going to supply the water. Because what we don't want to do is lay a lot of expensive pipe and make connections and then have no water supply. So there's a lot going on in the other side besides, you know, running it to the property and a well. You have got to make sure someone is going to run that system, and they have to comply with all the regulations of the State as far as a public water supply. Monitoring and testing and recording.

So someone's going to have to step up and say, yeah, they want to take on that responsibility. Also, how they're going to pay for it.

RESIDENT: When will you be -- are we going to have another meeting in the future? Are you going to kind of stay with us quarterly?

MR. MALOTT: We can. We can set up another meeting. Once we have data from the well or something to change and report, we can do it as fact sheets, or maybe expanded fact sheets and give you maybe more detail that way. It just depends on what's the best way. Does somebody want to sit down and read it at their dinner table or do they want to come down to the Midland Center here for a meeting? Some people like it

both ways or one or the other.

RESIDENT: I'd just like to get all the information that you have in a timely manner, you know, because knowledge is power for us. And I just don't want us to be caught. And I know you can only do so much, but you know, coming today and then not seeing you for eight or nine months is kind of alarming.

And I'm sorry, I wish there's a lot of us back here, and I don't -- you know that -- you know how many people are out there.

MR. MALOTT: Right.

RESIDENT: I don't know why the attendance was better at the Horseshoe than it was here, but it seems like when we come to meetings here, the attendance is never very high. I know everyone is concerned about their water, and I know some people are afraid to speak out.

MR. MALOTT: Well, we'll try different ways to do outreach and get the information to people. And we'll find a way that works best for maybe the majority, and maybe there's another way that works best for you.

RESIDENT: Maybe you need to look at Skype or something like that.

MR. MALOTT: There's always something.

RESIDENT: All right. Thank you.

MR. MALOTT: Yeah. Well, if there is no other questions -- yes?

RESIDENT: Who do you approve of locally to -- if we take our own water sample --

MR. MALOTT: I don't approve of any local labs. I can't give you an endorsement. I can't --

RESIDENT: Okay. The value of your property, if you're contaminated, it will be low.

MR. MALOTT: That's strictly between --

RESIDENT: Between the tax people and the --

MR. MALOTT: And the Tax Appraisal District. So I'll be here, the representatives from the Texas Department of Health Services will be here, as well as TCEQ. If there's other questions or you want to see maybe where your property is on this map, I will -- I'm here, and as long as y'all want to stay or until they close us.

RESIDENT: Are these two joined together?

MR. MALOTT: Well, that's what we want to find out is exactly how does the chromium that we detected north of I-20 impact what is south? Because the concentrations are so different. It's very high south of I-20, and it's relatively low levels north of

I-20. And so we need to understand is that just a small contributor source or is there another larger source that we haven't found yet?

RESIDENT: Well, do they run together or is that just separate? There's nothing up --

MR. MALOTT: Well, we just don't know how those low concentrations go away or does it increase? So that's one of my things is that we're installing monitoring wells to find out. That's just a really big difference between what's south of I-20 and north of I-20.

RESIDENT: Well, I just wondered if it was supposed to run together or what?

MR. MALOTT: And that's what we don't know. We don't know.

RESIDENT: I guess in a year from now I want to know if it went 60 or 100 feet sideways --

MR. MALOTT: We'll have -- we'll have a better idea in what the dispersion is of that plume as it goes out.

RESIDENT: We got some literature, but we don't know how to --

MR. MALOTT: Sure. I will be happy to go over that.

(MEETING CONCLUDED)

THE STATE OF TEXAS)

COUNTY OF MIDLAND)

I, Jane McGill, Certified Shorthand Reporter Number 1759 for The State of Texas, do hereby certify that the facts stated by me in the caption hereof are true, and that I did, in computerized stenotype shorthand, report said proceedings and that the above and foregoing pages contain a full, true and correct computer-assisted transcription of my computerized stenotype shorthand notes taken on said occasion.

I further certify that I am neither counsel for, related to, nor employed by any of the parties in the action in which this proceeding was taken, and further that I am not financially or otherwise interested in the outcome of the action.

Witness my hand this 15th day of April, 2011.

JANE McGILL, CSR
CSR No. 1759 - Expires 12/31/11
Permian Court Reporters, Inc.
P.O. Box 10625
Midland, Texas 79702
TEL: 432-683-3032
FAX: 432-683-5324